

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application and for indicating that claims 15-20 contain allowable subject matter.

**Disposition of the Claims**

Claims 1-14 and 16-20 are pending in this application. Claim 15 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1 and 8 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 8.

**Claim Amendments**

Claims 1 and 8 are amended by way of this reply to clarify the invention. No new subject matter is added by way of this amendment as support may be found, for example, on p. 6 ll. 7-21 and in Figure 2 of the originally filed Specification.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,279,825 (“Yokoyama”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,121,460 (“Parsons”) and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,098,170 (“Devanbu”). To the extent that this rejection applies to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

MPEP § 2143 states that “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The

Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.” Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner “must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference....” MPEP § 2143(A).

Independent claims 1 and 8 are amended by this reply to include the allowable subject matter of claim 15. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 8 now require, in part, that “the protected box is detachable from the first non protected box by the single connector without dismantling the first non protected box to attach the protected box to a second non protected box.” As admitted by the Examiner on page 6 of the Action mailed June 25, 2009, the aforementioned limitation is allowable. Therefore, Applicant asserts that none of Yokoyama, Parsons, and Devanbu disclose or render obvious the above quoted limitation required by the amended claims.

In view of the above, amended independent claims 1 and 8 are now allowable over the cited prior art. Pending dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 09669/091001).

Dated: October 22, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By           /Jonathan P. Osha/            
Jonathan P. Osha  
Registration No.: 33,986  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant